

GENERAL LIBRARY,

UNIV. OF MICH.

FEB 24 1909

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL II

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 3, 1908

No 1

At the meeting of The Classical Association at Washington, D. C., in April last, Prof. H. L. Wilson, of Johns Hopkins University, gave in somewhat condensed form the admirable lecture on Recent Archaeological Progress in Rome, which he has been delivering at various places for the Archaeological Institute of America. We hope to give an abstract of the lecture at another time. For the present I wish to give expression to certain thoughts suggested by the lecture, which seem to me worth attention at this time when scholars and teachers alike are beginning another year of work.

Professor Wilson devoted most of his lecture to a presentation of the discoveries made in 1907 in connection with the Column and the Forum of Trajan (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, I. 62-63). He told how a very trivial incident had set Commendatore Boni, director of the excavations at Rome, famous for his discoveries in the Forum, to thinking afresh concerning certain problems which had long perplexed archaeologists. Doubtless every visitor to Trajan's Forum had noticed that a large piece had at some time been knocked out of the wreath which garlands the Column at the bottom. How had this been done? It remained for the year 1907 to witness the answer to this query. And how simple the answer was! In a moment of inspiration Commendatore Boni thought of trying a simple experiment, that of letting an object drop from the platform which surmounts the Column, from a point above the break in the wreath. The experiment was wholly successful; it was perfectly plain that a heavy object thus dropped would strike the very spot whence the piece had been broken out of the wreath, and Mr. Boni concluded at once that the statue which formerly stood upon the Column had been dropped over the edge of the platform and in its fall had carried away a part of the wreath. Remembering how often broken pieces of statues and columns have been left lying unheeded, to be covered in time by earth, Mr. Boni dug for the missing piece of the wreath and found it!

Another puzzle connected with the Column of Trajan was the location of the sepulchral chamber which, it was believed, was somewhere in the Column. After a time, behind the door by which access is had to the staircase within the Column, Boni discovered a place where there had evidently

once been an opening which had later been filled up with concrete. When this concrete had been cut away a chamber was discovered which Boni regards as the lost sepulchral chamber; it is at least large enough for that purpose.

Two lessons flow from the facts which have been cited, lessons diametrically opposed each to the other. The one is a lesson of humility. How many people have looked at the break in the wreath without hitting on the absurdly simple explanation of its origin! For how many years it has been possible for a close observer to look behind the door into the Column and see what Boni saw! How humble all this should make us, as we reflect on the blindness of generation after generation of scholars, their failure to think, their sheeplike tendency to follow in one another's steps, and then reflect on the simple expedients which here won success! How absurd much of our elaborate work, our strained hypotheses seem in the light of Boni's discoveries! One thinks of the absurd guesses made concerning the use of *bidens* in the sense of sheep, till some one thought of the simple scheme of examining a sheep's mouth.

On the other hand there is here a lesson of encouragement. It is the fashion to talk and write as if all the problems of classical philology were settled and as if nothing worth while remained to be done in this field. We are constantly told (especially by those who are not pre-eminently students of the Classics) how circumscribed the classical field is and how thoroughly it has been tilled. Yet here before all men's eyes were two problems still unsolved in 1907, solved in that year by the simple expedients of using one's eyes and one's brains. One thinks of Mr. Van Buren's discoveries in the Temple of Castor, made in similarly simple ways, and of Miss Van Deman's work at the Hemicycle (the Rostra at the Western end of the Forum). All these discoveries show that the opportunity of advancing the boundaries of classical knowledge in the sphere of archaeology is not yet past forever, even in fields presumably tilled a thousand times. In the domain of classical literature, also, much remains to be done. There are passages in authors as much studied as Horace and Vergil, which yet await elucidation. Mr. Holmes's Conquest of Britain shows how laurels may even yet be won by close study of Caesar's Gallic War.

So, then, let us take heart of hope. There is work still to be done in the classic fields in archaeology, in philology, in the interpretation of texts, and, most of all for us Americans, in the interpretation of ancient life to our own countrymen, to the end that they may see the practical value which a study of that life has for them, and that the day of the Classics may be with us a long day, full of abounding life and vigor.

C. K.

HOW FAR DOES THE WORD-ORDER IN LATIN INDICATE THE PROPER EMPHASIS?¹

This question might be answered, in part at least, very simply and definitely, if we could accept the dictum of some particular grammar. "In all sentences", says Gildersleeve (672, a), "Beginning and End are emphatic points"; no, says Harkness (665, 1, 2), "Any word, except the subject, may be made emphatic by being placed at the beginning of the sentence—any word, except the predicate, at the end"; not so, say Allen and Greenough (597, b), "The more important word is never placed last for emphasis"; and most explicit and sweeping of all is the statement in the revised Andrews and Stoddard (585), "The first word in any combination is more emphatic than the second, the second more emphatic than the third and so on".

Obviously these statements cannot all be right: the curious fact is that they are really all wrong. The wonder is that any Latinist was ever persuaded, in dealing with so flexible a thing as an inflected language, to put such inflexible statements into cold type. How could the Romans have been satisfied to speak or write with the emphasis always falling in the same places? For ourselves, we claim the privilege of emphasizing almost any word in any part of a sentence, long or short. Is it not quite inconceivable that the Romans were inhibited by any rules of composition, rhetoric, or oratory from doing exactly the same thing? If any one doubts, let him consider the fact that *ne—quidem* with an emphatic word or phrase between may stand in any part of a sentence from the very beginning to the very end.

As a first step in this broad field, too broad to be fully traversed in one paper, let us consider the Greenough theory. "In connected discourse the word most prominent in the speaker's mind comes first, and so on in the order of prominence" (597). Now "most prominent" should mean also most emphatic, the word deserving most attention, and therefore receiving the chief vocal stress. Otherwise it could mean only that the writer placed first the word which he thought ought to come first, a proposition which is scarcely debatable. The same principle is

applied to clauses, which "are usually arranged in the order of prominence in the mind of the speaker" (601, b).

So then a Latin sentence was written and spoken big end first: it began with a trumpet-blast, at least in the orator's strenuous moments, and came out at the little end of the horn.

Now beyond question, the practice of oratory had large influence on literary style. "Who has ever doubted", says Cicero (Orator 141), "that in our republic eloquence has always filled the chief role when the city was at peace". But orators have small use for the anti-climax, except to produce humorous or satirical effects. Yet, if the Greenough-Prebbe theory is correct, the Romans must have avoided the climax¹ altogether, for "the first word is more emphatic than the second, the second than the third and so on". Climax is a ladder, and a ladder is primarily for climbing up: the supporters of this theory seem to think that the Romans used it chiefly to go down cellar.

Again, this theory assumes, possibly unconsciously to its authors, that emphasis was the sole consideration, or at any rate by far the most important one, in determining the order of Latin words, phrases, and clauses. According to the theory, any word beginning a sentence is *ipso facto* the most emphatic word in it; the second word is next in emphasis, and so on. Hence, to avoid distortion of emphasis, and therefore of meaning, the most emphatic word must be sought out and placed first, without regard to connection, perspicuity, or euphony. But we know upon the most authoritative testimony that other considerations had large influence. Some of the objectionable features to be avoided by a proper arrangement of words were the following: a harsh combination of final and initial consonants; objectionable hiatus; a monotonous series of similar endings, especially if two or more syllables were involved, as in Cicero's unlucky *O fortunatam natam me consule Romam*; a succession of monosyllables, of short verbs and nouns, or of unduly long ones; and any other combination which seemed unpleasing to a critical ear.

A sort of prose rhythm was also aimed at by careful writers, especially in their most finished passages. This must fall short of recognizable poetical forms, and yet must be distinctly harmonious. It is well known that Cicero gives to this subject minute and laborious attention in his *Orator*, illustrating by amending the expressions of others and by marring his own. It is difficult to resist the impression that his zeal as an advocate of rhythmic prose leads him into some exaggeration; but Quintilian is equally explicit, and we are obliged to conclude that *numerus*

¹ This paper was read (in part) at the second annual meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Washington, D. C., April 25, 1908.

¹ The word is here used in the most general sense, not in the technical Latin sense of *gradatus* (Quintill 9.3.54), though that involves the same principle.

in its double sense of metrical clausulae and balanced phrasing (Orat. 223, etc.) was an important element in shaping the best Latin style.

Perspicuity was also considered in arranging Latin sentences, however small the evidence of this may seem to beginners. It is sufficient to cite Quintil. 9. 4. 27: "Words indeed are not arranged by feet, and may therefore be transferred from one place to another, so as to be joined with those to which they are most suitable, as, in piling together unhewn stones, their very irregularity suggests to what other stones they may be applied and where they may rest. The happiest kind of composition, however, is that in which a judicious order, proper connection and harmony of cadence are found combined".

Now it is an utter impossibility that every Latin word in an oration or even in a paragraph should at one and the same time fulfil all these conditions: (1) that it should occupy its proper place in a graduated scale of emphasis ranging from the maximum on the first word to the minimum on the last; (2) that it should be perspicuous just there; (3) that it should combine in delivery agreeably with the word before and after; (4) that it should be neither too long nor too short to secure euphony in connection with the adjacent words; (5) that, if in a clausula, it should be of the right metrical value to avoid a poetical rhythm and secure a suitable prose rhythm.

But the theory which I am questioning further implies that the unit of expression is the single word. No intelligent student of language would seriously maintain this. The original impulse must have been, not to the naming of concepts, but to the expression of ideas. It must be often true in Latin as in English that two or more words are equally necessary to the conveying of a thought, so that emphasis upon any one perverts the meaning. For an English example, take the Scripture phrase, "all that the prophets have spoken". If we say, "O slow of heart to believe *all* that the prophets have spoken", we imply that but little was rejected; emphasizing "prophets" suggests that they preferred historians or other writers to the prophets; while, if we lay stress on the word "spoken", the impression would be that they greatly preferred to have the prophet write his sermon. In other words, this phrase is a unit, and must be delivered with level emphasis, or the meaning is impaired. The same thing must be true in every language. And when a teacher undertakes to make his pupils find in emphasis a reason for every variation in Latin order, he is attempting the impossible.

Any theory therefore of an all-the-way-down-hill sort of emphasis must be laid aside. The opposite theory, an all-the-way-uphill emphasis, is equally disproved by the considerations already presented.

But criticism is ever the easier task. What can

be done toward the construction of a satisfactory theory?

First, it must be said that, so far as we can judge from the stylistic writings of the Romans, emphasis had very little *conscious* effect upon the arrangement of their sentences. In all of Cicero's criticisms and rearrangements in the *Orator* he nowhere drops a hint that the demands of emphasis must be regarded. Indeed *eadem verba eadem sententia* (Orat. 215) seems to have been a literary axiom. In Orat. 214 he quotes from Carbo the words *patris dictum sapiens temeritas fili comprobavit*. These six words conclude a period and the last word is what Cicero called a *dichoreus*. "By this double trochee", he adds, "the gathering was roused to such enthusiasm that it was wonderful. I ask whether this was *not* due to the rhythm; change the order of the words; make it thus: *comprobavit fili temeritas*: it will at once amount to nothing, although *temeritas* consists of three shorts and a long, which Aristotle approves as the best, but I disagree with him".

This illustrates what was referred to above as the bias of an advocate. How much Cicero ignores in this passage, when he claims everything for *numerus!* (1) The arrangement proposed would be momentarily ambiguous: *dictum sapiens* might be nominative, and the hearer, joining this possible subject with a very natural verb, would find himself obliged to reconstruct the clause after the last word was uttered and this blurring of the thought would serve as a cushion to break the force of the impact. (2) The juxtaposition of contraries, as in *sapiens temeritas*, was a favorite embellishment. (3) The chiasmus *patris dictum temeritas fili* is also frequent. (4) The subject being now in mind, there follows a verb whose meaning is agreeably paradoxical. One would not expect a son's rashness to approve or sanction a father's wisdom. But after the foregoing statements the paradox is plainly justified, and the idea finds a most felicitous expression. (5) Last, but possibly not least, *comprobavit* is a good, round mouthful, that needs strong emphasis by reason of its intrinsic importance, and will carry gracefully all that the orator can give.

But if we were to take oratorical rhythm at Cicero's own valuation, it would guide us but a very little way. So far as it is dependent upon definite feet, it applies only to the close of a period, or, according to Quintilian, to the beginning and the end. Cicero moreover warns very particularly against using the rhythmical structure to excess. It has no place in the plain style (Orat. 221), that is, it is excluded from large portions of all forensic work. And being an artificial embellishment it must not be used so constantly anywhere as to betray the artifice (Orat. 209). Apparently these limitations upon the use of the rhythmical clausula have not been sufficiently regarded. Scholars industriously count the

occurrences of this and that combination through entire orations, when large portions, according to Cicero's own statement, have no bearing on the question.

In the absence, then, of definite statements by Latin writers, we are forced to examine their language from the modern point of view. While they have very little to say about emphasis, we cannot doubt that it was an important element in their delivery. We are probably safe in assuming, moreover, that they used emphasis for the same reasons that we do. We shall do wisely, therefore, to fix upon one or two principles which we may justly regard as of universal validity.

Why do we emphasize a word in speaking, or underscore it in writing? For one of two reasons: either (1) it is intrinsically important or (2) relatively important. Words of energy will be stressed, those of mild or neutral meaning will be more quietly uttered. It seems clear from Quintilian (9. 3. 47) that we are here on safe ground, for he assures us that in the exordium of the Milo, *Etsi vereor*, with which the oration begins, should be delivered more quietly than *pro fortissimo viro* a few words farther on.

A word used in a pregnant sense, to imply more than it normally expresses, will receive marked emphasis, even though by itself it would suggest a more quiet utterance. In line with this, Quintilian (8. 3. 86) tells us that in the simple expression *virum esse oportet*, emphasis gives the word *virum* more than its customary meaning. "Yes", says some hearer, "and he puts *virum* first". In Livy 1. 59 Lucretia says to her husband, father, and their two friends, "This deed of Tarquin will prove my death and his, if you are men"; here the Latin is *si vos viri estis*. And in the Tusculans (2. 53) Cicero says *At vero C. Marius, rusticarus vir, sed plane vir*. Also Ita et tulit dolorem ut *vir* et ut *homo MAIOREM ferre sine causa necessaria* NOLUIT.

So much for the matter of intrinsic importance. Relative importance arises from contrast, either in meaning, as peace opposed to war, or in the form of statement, as positive and negative predicates, and words of opposite meaning in general.

A more subtle variety of relative importance is often manifest in passing from one group of words to another closely related group. Emphasis will fall upon the *new* idea in the following phrase or clause; while words that simply repeat a previous concept, merely for the sake of clearness, will receive no stress.

English examples will serve best for illustration just here: the use of Latin might seem an effort to beg the question.

Shakespeare makes Marcellus say to the crowds: "You blocks! you stones! you worse than senseless things!" The climax is evident. Stones are rhetori-

cally more insensate than blocks. The hasty reader would probably complete his climax by strong emphasis on senseless. "You blocks! you STONES! you worse than SENSELESS things!" But such a rendering is certainly incorrect. Blocks and stones themselves are senseless things: this phrase therefore is a mere repetition, and the stress must fall on the new and climactic word "worse". "You blocks! you STONES! you (searching in vain for a more vigorous metaphor) *WORSE* than senseless things!"

So in Macbeth: "To be *thus* is nothing; but to be SAFELY *thus*". And Hamlet: "If thou wilt needs marry, marry a fool". To emphasize the repeated word of such a pair is not merely inappropriate: for any reader of sound mind it is impossible. Do we hazard anything in assuming that it was impossible also in Latin?

Let us consider a few Latin phrases in the light of these principles. According to the theories here controverted, when a genitive precedes the limited noun, the emphasis belongs on the genitive. Now in speaking for the Manilian Law, Cicero tells the people that, if prosperity is to continue, their allies must be preserved not only from *disaster*, but also from the *DREAD* of disaster. It is inconceivable that an orator in any language would emphasize like this: not only from *disaster*, but also from the dread of *DISASTER*. The Latin reads (De Imp. 16): *non solum (ut ante dixi) calamitate, sed etiam calamitatis FORMIDINE liberatos*. So in Livy 1. 7 we read *facinus facinorisque causam*, "the daring deed and the *reason* for it"; where the genitive is so devoid of emphasis that we naturally represent it by the pronoun "it".

COLGATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GREENE

(To be concluded)

RECENT EXCAVATIONS AT PERGAMON

The results of excavations made by the German Institute at Pergamon in 1904-1905 are presented in the last issue of the *Athenische Mittheilungen*, Vol. 32, Nos. 2 and 3. The report consists of four chapters, the first, written by Dörpfeld, on the buildings, the second and third by Hepding, on the inscriptions and separate finds, the fourth by Kolbe, on lists of ephebes.

The most interesting discoveries fall under the first heading. An imposing Greek house of the time of the Pergamene kings was uncovered on the southern slope of the citadel. As rebuilt in the Roman period it was owned by the Consul Attalos according to information derived from an inscription. Its appearance in Hellenistic times, a large central court surrounded by a portico from which opened living rooms, corresponds to the plan of the Roman house as seen best in Pompeii.

Work was also devoted to further excavation of the gymnasium. This consists of a tripartite arrangement whereby separate buildings for youths,

listed under three categories according to age, were constructed on terraces of varying levels, an expedient necessitated by the slope of the hill. Under a portion of the highest section was found a large and elaborate cellar construction, more than 200 m. long, which was strongly built and contained many small windows for lighting purposes. This Dörpfeld believes to be a practice stadion, an indoor underground running track, which would be warm in winter and cool in summer.

New work on the theater served to throw light on the question of the stage structure by locating many hitherto undiscovered holes intended to receive the wooden posts, and by determining the relationship of the three series one to another. It was found that the holes in the front series are .30 m. less deep than the others, from which Dörpfeld argues that the rear rows were intended to support the two-storied skene while the front row supported the one-storied proskénion. Against the view that there was a stage on which the action took place are the great size of the posts, .35 m. thick and .70 m. in the ground, and their peculiar grouping, which points to the familiar triple arrangement of the façade of skene and proskénion. Accurate measurements have shown that the theater was constructed symmetrically on the basis of a unit or ell of .525 m.

Another task undertaken was the penetration to the heart of several tumuli in the neighborhood of the city in the search for graves. Success crowned this search in the campaign of the autumn of 1906, of which a brief account is given in a postscript. In two small tumuli were found graves in which were two sarcophagi, one of a man, the other of a woman, containing among other objects a gold oak wreath, gilded myrtle wreaths, two iron swords and two silver coins belonging to the fourth century B. C.

The second chapter consists of 153 inscriptions. Of these No. 22 is a dedication to Poseidon in the Aeolic dialect and is assigned at latest to the fifth century B. C. The list of ephebes contains 133 numbers. The separate finds are chiefly fragmentary pieces of sculpture, several dating from the Hellenistic period, a few small bronzes, terracottas, sherds of pottery, and lamps.

BARNARD COLLEGE

T. L. SHEAR

REVIEWS

Plato: *The Apology and Crito*. Edited by Isaac Flagg. New York: American Book Co. (1907). Pp. 205. \$1.40.

The first inspection of this volume gives one the impression, which is confirmed by further examination, that the editor has practiced due moderation and has not fallen into the common error of overloading the commentary. The notes, as a rule,

are brief, sane and scholarly and, in general, sufficiently comprehensive. In a few instances, however, the freshmen who read the *Apology* as their first collegiate Greek are entitled to some additional comments, and more grammar references would be an improvement.

The editor's explanation of two matters may be noted. First, *όρχήστρα* *Apol.* 26 E, is said to be a place, elsewhere than in the theater, where books could be purchased. But the text does not say that books could be bought in the *όρχήστρα* for *ταῦτα* refers to doctrines, not to books. The editor, however, gives no hint of any interpretation other than his own, which, to say the least, is doubtful. Again, in *Apol.* 30 E, *μύωψ* is translated 'spur,' with no suggestion of its earlier literal meaning, 'gadfly'; and Socrates is said to compare himself to the rider who applies the stimulus. But the use of *ιντρ* with the genitive *μύωτος* is against the editor's interpretation of this noun. So, too, the metaphor of the fly seems to be implied in the phrase *πανταχοῦ προσκαθίζων* and in the comparison of the Athenians striking Socrates to men roused from a nap.

The plan of appending an index as a supplement to the notes is to be indorsed but the scope of the index is open to criticism. Apparently no definite system has been followed in the selection of subject-matter to be included, except that all the proper names found in the two dialogues are registered. In the opinion of the reviewer, the index should have been limited, at least, to a discussion of the proper names and the antiquities and should not have been made to include also a treatment of many idioms, constructions and stylistic usages. The place for notes of the latter character is at the foot of the page, in connection with the text. Certainly they should be wholly in one place or the other. It is more or less annoying and results in loss of time to have to search through a lengthy discussion to find the point in question and the average student will be tempted not to take this trouble. It is rather difficult to see why certain brief comments, at least, are relegated to the index, such, for example, as that on *θη*, and many others. Moreover, it serves no special purpose to have treated certain matters in the index, for example, *δέκιον*, *ἐπέσθαι*, *ἐρωτᾶν*, *ἐπιστήμη*, and many others, without giving in the notes a reference to such treatment. The majority of the students will not find these articles.

Interspersed at frequent intervals throughout the notes are excellent summaries of succeeding sections, which will afford the student legitimate help in the comprehension of the argument. No rhetorical analysis or formal treatment of the structure of the dialogues is attempted, though these matters are briefly touched upon in the introduction.

This introduction is admirably conceived and executed. It gives an insight into the state of knowledge and spirit of the times and presents a general view of the scenery and nature of the dialogues in a style that students should find attractive. The methods, personality and character of Socrates are vividly portrayed. This is very well accomplished in part by interweaving translations of appropriate selections from other works of Plato and one from the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon. In this way a deeper interest in the ancient authors may be stimulated—a highly desirable result, for the reading of classical students is confined to altogether too few of the masterpieces. So the editor does well to lead his readers to the sources by placing in his introduction, for illustrating the art of Socrates, these "scraps from the sumptuous profusion spread out in the Platonic writings". The author is thus made to serve as his own introduction—an excellent plan when possible.

Following the introduction is a brief but useful chronological table of important events, from the birth of Socrates to his death. An appendix contains a table of various readings. The absence of an English index is to be regretted.

The proof-reading has not been quite as accurate as we have a right to demand. In the summary on p. 50 "distinguish educator" is a case of haplography. Other errors are *āv* for *āv*, p. 62, l. 5; *Μελητός* p. 64, l. 3; 23 C for 24 C, p. 66, in the summary; fire for stone, p. 72, in the summary; *Ἀμφίπολες*, p. 81, l. 3; 18 D for 18 E, and *Ἐγαρ γωγε* p. 164, s. v. *ἀξιων*; 17 D for 17 B, p. 182, s. v. *λόγος*. There are also some unfortunate instances of imperfect typography, as on pp. 60, 65, 68, 126, 156, 205, especially on p. 68. All these are minor defects, however, and do not seriously impair the usefulness and general excellence of the work, which should prove a highly satisfactory text-book for college classes.

ROSCOE GUERNSEY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LAURIGER HORATIUS

In these degenerate days when colleges and universities have practically thrown the Classics overboard for the sake of courses in insurance and business management it is pleasant to find men wholly removed from academic influences standing up for a poet who was not without honor a generation ago. The brilliant Gladstonian days when a Greek quotation was not unusual in Parliament and a mistake in Latin quantity was hooted have gone by, but however elderly it may be, the generation still lives that can understand an allusion to Pyrrha and Lallage, to a man "integer vitae sclerisque purus", to a monument more lasting than brass, or to the hatred of "Persicos apparatus", the Frenchified fuss of Thackeray. For such has been compiled the

"Horace" by Charles Loomis Dana and John Cotton Dana (The Elm Tree Press, Woodstock, Vt.).

It is clearly a labor of love. The translations of the poems are arranged according to subjects, and though the editors select from all who have made a try at rendering the Latin poet into English, from Dryden to Eugene Field, they hold in the main to the excellent versions of Sir Stephen de Vere, the brother of Aubrey de Vere. A number of entertaining essays are prefixed, among them an ingenious autobiography put together from the *Epistles* and *Satires*, a disquisition on Horace's ailments by Dr. Dana, and a careful account of the geography of his poems. While Horace is above all others the poet of the man of the world, he betrays more human feeling in his poems according to modern standards than any other Latin poet save Catullus. This selection brings that element out distinctly.

Typographically the book is very attractive. There are many illustrations, some from modern pictures, but the greater number from the quaint eighteenth century wood cuts used to illustrate Francis's translation.—*New York Sun*, May 2, 1908.

RES VARIAE

The Royal Museum authorities in Berlin have just published the text of a fine collection of Greek papyri discovered by Dr. Rubensohn on Elephantine, an island in the Nile opposite Assuan, and deciphered by the discoverer. One of the most interesting documents is a marriage contract of 310 B. C. This was the time when Ptolemy I, one of Alexander the Great's generals, became King of Egypt. It is therefore by far the most ancient of all authentically dated Greek records.

A deed of marriage is drawn up between Heraclides, a Greek mercenary, and Demetria, daughter of Leptines and Philotis, his wife, of the island of Kos, in the Aegean Sea. The bride brings a dowry of clothes and ornaments to the value of one talent. The deed is witnessed by six companions in arms, compatriots of the bridegroom.

The terms of the contract are worthy of notice. If the wife prove unfaithful, it says, she must leave her husband and lose all claim on the dowry, but three witnesses of the transgression must be produced, accepted by both parties. This shows that even in those remote times a woman was not a chattel under the husband's autocratic sway, but possessed certain well defined rights of her own.

Should the husband break faith with the wife, he must return the dowry in full and in addition pay proportionate damages. Here also the testimony of three accepted witnesses is required. Demetria, the deed further stipulates, was to join her lord in Egypt, but would afterward return with him to Hellas, where Heraclides possessed property and ships.—*New York Sun*, March 1, 1908.

The discovery in the foundations of the Temple of Fortune at Pompeii of a small walled in space containing an empty shell of a tortoise induced Professor Mau to write a treatise, which was read the other day before the Archaeological Society of Rome, on the ancient superstition of insuring the safety of a building by immuring a living creature in its walls.

The idea, explained the Professor, obtained in ancient Greece and throughout the Balkan Peninsula that no more effective protection against evil spirits could be found than by enclosing in the walls of a house a living being, preferably human, so that its soul might live in it for ever and guard it from unseen harm. When the city of Antioch was rebuilt after an earthquake by the Emperor Trajan a maiden was immured alive in one of the chief temples and a statue erected to her memory as the city's Goddess of Fortune.

Even to this day the ancient belief survives in the Near East, but a substitute is now generally found for the sacrifice. To propitiate the spirits an animal, either alive or slaughtered beforehand, is placed within the foundations or the walls, or more commonly a person's shadow is measured with a piece of string, and this measure, representing the person concerned, is then walled up in the masonry.

In the case of the Pompeian temple the tortoise was doubtless selected because it would keep alive for a long period without nourishment, and the belief prevailed that the charm was particularly potent while the victim remained alive.—*New York Sun*, May 2, 1908.

I recall a student who once added a little to a well-merited reputation for stupidity by translating in an examination paper Horace's line *nec vespertinus circum gemit ursus ovile* by "nor does the vespertinian ursus grunt around the ovile", and most of your readers have likely heard of the boy who, after translating the present *rex fugit* correctly, was told to translate it in the perfect, when he promptly said "The king has fleas".

EDWIN POST

All your readers must enjoy the little corner devoted to felicitous blunders in translation. Perhaps the following may deserve a place. In Ep. 1. 1. 104 Horace says to Maecenas *prave sectum stomacheris ob unguem*. This was once rendered, "You are sick at the stomach at the sight of a mutilated snake".

JOHN GREENE

A new entrance to the Forum has been planned at the end of the Via Cavour, where the temporary office of the excavations used to stand, and where now about 3,000 cubic meters of earth have been removed. It is hoped that the old gateway of the Farnese gardens on the Palatine, which is now scattered in fragments, may be made to serve as the entrance.—*New York Evening Post*, August 8.

LATIN VERSION

Many a green isle needs must be
In the deep sea of misery
Or the mariner, worn and wan,
Never thus could voyage on,
Day and night and night and day
Drifting on his weary way.

.....
Ay! may flowering islands lie
In the waters of wide misery!

—Shelley.

INSULAE FORTUNATAE

Insulas multas virides necesse est
in mari lato et misero iacere;
sin minus, fessus pavidusque nauta
pallidus ore
non iter posset facere usque vento
quotquot et noctes pereunt diesque,
fluctibus saevis agitatus atque
aequore fessus.
En, iacent late nitidae et refertae
floribus gratis homini dolenti
insulæ tales in aqua patente, in
aequore luctus!

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG

Not pleasures, as most know them, lead the way
Into the time beyond time; nor agree
With every year of life; and are not strong
In changing place, themselves unchanged to be.
But youth and age meet fairly at the feast
Made ready by the true joys of the mind;
By these prosperity becomes increased,
And refuge from distress in them we find.
At home they bring delight. When forth we fare
They burden not. They watch with us at night,
With steadfastness the hours of exile share
Or render every holiday more bright.
Thus, Cicero, you wrote of joys. We heard
And found an endless joy within your word.

NORMAL COLLEGE

JEANNETTE S. SEWELL

It may be that Homer in the original Greek is not so much read in these days as he was a century ago. Nevertheless, estimated in dollars and cents, there is good reasons for thinking that the Father of Epic Poetry has attained a valuation among the book collectors of this generation that is quite unprecedented in the annals of this kind of literary appreciation. At a sale of rare books in London this month \$1,650 was paid for a "first edition" of Homer. At a similar sale just a year ago the record price of \$1,900 was paid for a copy of the same edition—the *editio princeps*, issued at Florence in 1488. It is interesting to note, moreover, that the library from which the Homer was purchased this year at Sotheby's was the well-known "Hoskier Library", which was recently sent from New Jersey to England.—*New York Times*, July 11, '08.

